

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly from November through April by the Department of Classical Languages at Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri.
Subscription price: \$2.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter at the Saint Louis, Missouri, Post-Office under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME 35

JANUARY 1959

NUMBER 3

Another View of Turnus

Turnus is as one who is heedless of national well being or divine decree, if, at any cost to anybody and everybody, he can gratify his own wishes.¹

There is a sharp contrast between strength devoid of reason and strength, tempered with wisdom, the dominant qualities of Turnus and Aeneas.²

Thus two modern scholars have tried to illuminate, or rather overshadow, in Vergil's *Aeneis*, the chief antagonist of Aeneas, Turnus. The tendency is to dwell on the calm deliberation and wisdom of Aeneas and thus magnify the Trojan leader, and likewise to hesitate on the impetuosity and sheer brute strength of Turnus in order to diminish the King of the Rutuli. Critics seem afraid to praise Turnus lest they dim the brightness of Aeneas. The truth is that a consideration of Turnus in his proper light will brighten the greatness of Aeneas because of the greatness of Turnus.

One's meeting with the son of Daunus and Venilia comes early in the seventh book. He is the favorite wooer for the hand of Lavinia.

... petit ante alios pulcherrimus omnes
Turnus, avis atavisque potens, quem regia coniunx
adiungi generum miro properabat amore (*Aen.* 7.55-57).

Turnus as General

We find him fully aware of the arrival of the Trojans. Perhaps he is awaiting an explanation of the purpose of the friendly invasion. It is Allecto, her head covered with serpents and breathing vengeance and war, who disturbs his calm sleep in order to try to stir him to drive out the Trojans. Here, before he is possessed by the Fury, we can see the real character of Turnus. His response to the disguised Allecto shows both his military genius and a calm deliberation of which critics often deprive him.

Hic iuvenis, vatem inridens, sic orsa vicissim
ore refert
bella viri pacemque gerent, quis bella gerenda
(*Aen.* 7.435-436, 444).

The frenzied cry of line 464 in the seventh book is the direct result of the action of angered Allecto. Turnus is plunged into war by a power greater than his will to resist. Once, however, the war has begun we behold the King of the Rutuli as an outstanding, gallant leader.

Ipsae inter primos praestanti corpore Turnus
vertitur arma tenens et toto vertice supra est
(*Aen.* 7.783-784).

Turnus does not direct his forces from the rear but rather *adest mediaque; medio dux agmine Turnus;*

In this issue . . .

Another View of Turnus Francis X. Quinn, S.J. 25

Value of Odaxius' Translation of Cebes' *Tabula*
Chauncey Edgar Finch 27

Meanings of *Res* in the *De Rerum Natura*
Sister M. Renelle Ojeman, S.S.N.D. 29

Foreign Languages for the Doctorate Editorial 30

Verse: Vergil's Seventh *Ecloga* (Translated)
Alfred Nonny 31

Breviora: Greek Studies for English Doctoral Candidates (Raymond V. Schoder, S.J., page 33).
Smoke-screens in Ancient Warfare (Alfred P. Dorjahn, page 33). Mary Isabel Sibley Fellowship (Carl Billman, page 34). Eta Sigma Phi Contests for 1959 (page 34). The Little Woman (D. Herbert Abel, page 34).

Book Reviews: C. A. Robinson, Jr., editor, *Selections from Greek and Roman Historians* (A. G. McKay, page 35). R. P. Lawson, *Origen: The Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies* (M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J., page 35). John F. C. Richards, *Essentials of Latin* (John E. Rexine, page 35). F. E. Adcock, *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (William Charles Korfmacher, page 36).

Materials Available through the Office of THE
CLASSICAL BULLETIN 36

Turnus, ut ante volans tardum praecesserat agmen
(*Aen.* 7.577; 9.28, 47).

Early in the eighth book, we once again witness the mature deliberation of a general, as Turnus musters his forces for an attack. His troops are over-excited at the thought of the approaching conflict, but Turnus remains calm throughout the event.

The famed Aenean epithet, *pius*, can also be applied to Turnus. He is certainly loyal to his country and his gods.

... medium video discedere caelum
palantisque polo stellas, sequor omina tanta
(*Aen.* 9.20-21).

His Generalship Disclosed

At the siege of the Trojan walls, the generalship of Turnus unfolds itself before us. Despite a shower of stones from the walls above, he is ever rushing to them in attack. Once we find him hurling a blazing torch at the fortification, later he returns to the very wall in pursuit of Lycus, and still again he is one of the first to scale the fortifications. Many valiant Trojans fall beneath the swift moving sword of Turnus (*Aen.* 9.547-576).

He fought valiantly despite certain handicaps. Early in the conflict Latinus, a man whom Turnus greatly respected, his father-in-law to be, showed dissatisfaction with Turnus's cause. Turnus never lost heart, although his followers were always bat-

ting fear and discontent: *At non audaci Turno fiducia cessit* (Aen. 9.126) and *Haud tamen audaci Turno fiducia cessit* (Aen. 10.276).

The tenth book finds Turnus in perpetual motion. He has decided on, or rather been forced into, a course of action by Allecto, and he will carry through his assignment: *Nec Turnum segnis retinet mora* (Aen. 10.308).

Perhaps Alcides' words to Pallas throw light on Turnus.

... etiam sua Turnum,
fata vocant metasque dati pervenit ad aevi
(Aen. 10.471-472).

Throughout this epic within an epic, Turnus, who is the unifying element of books seventh to twelfth, has several motives for goading himself on. Two of the principal ones are his love for Lavinia and the love for his threatened homeland. For such reasons can the conduct of Turnus be called selfish?

Parallel Strength of the Two Leaders

There is a marked equality of strength between Aeneas and Turnus. In line 482 of the tenth book, we see Turnus mortally wound Pallas by hurling his spear through a shield made from plates of iron, brass, and bull's hide. At the death of Pallas, Turnus shows the magnanimity of a hero by returning the body to Evander for a decent burial. When Turnus momentarily rejoices over the conquered spoils, he acts as naturally as did Hector over the body of Patroclus. Turnus's valor further shows itself in the pursuit of Aeneas' image (Aen. 10. 645-652). Self-control had on an earlier occasion been displayed despite the threats of the frenzied Pandarus: *Olli subridens sedato pectore Turnus* (Aen. 9.740). There he even waits for Pandarus to begin the fray, for Turnus understands a fraternal love has enkindled the flames of Pandarus' wrath. Finally, near the end of the ninth book, Turnus had withdrawn step by step because of the overwhelming numbers: ... *Turnus paulatim excedere pugna* (Aen. 9.789).

The eleventh book shows us Turnus resolved in his undertaking. He has received a mixed support from his allies:

Multa simul contra variis sententia dictis
pro Turno ... (Aen. 11. 222-223).

Turnus hears of Aeneas' achievements but shows no fear:

Et saevum Aenean agnovit Turnus in armis
adventumque pedum flatuque audivit equorum
(Aen. 11.910-911).

In the twelfth book, many of Turnus's characteristics are reiterated. He is self-controlled, merciful to the conquered foe, appreciative of magnanimity in his foes, and he manifests justice and piety in various ways. Despite great fatigue, he leads his men on, and even in the midst of fatigue he shows resignation to the will of the gods:

Quo deus et quo dura vocat Fortuna, sequamur
(Aen. 12.676).

To save the remnant of his battered, exhausted army, he offers himself in single combat (Aen. 12. 694-696). Here, as before, the words of his people are ringing in his ears:

Turne, in te suprema salus, miserere tuorum.
(Aen. 12.653).

Although the gods have turned their faces from him (Aen. 12.646-649), he will fight for the woman he loves. He expresses a willingness to give up Lavinia in return for the privilege of living for his people. Thus he proves that the true object of his love is not Lavinia but *Patria*. The final struggle between Aeneas and Turnus very much resembles the one fought on the Plains of Troy by Achilles and Hector. When the heat and smoke of battle subside we feel much as we did at the end of the *Iliad*. We have a great and sympathetic appreciation for the fallen hero. Just as Achilles proved himself a mighty warrior by conquering Hector, so Aeneas achieves his real greatness, his worthiness to found and rule a new nation, because he has conquered a genuine hero, Turnus.

Francis X. Quinn, S.J.

Georgetown Preparatory School,
Garrett Park, Maryland

NOTES

1 T. R. Glover, *Virgil* (London 1930) 229. 2 Henry W. Prescott, *Development of Virgil's Art* (Chicago 1936) 140.

We shall not find that the splendour of the poem <the Aeneis> depends on detached passages, but far more on the great manner and movement which, interfused with the unique Virgilian tenderness, sustains the whole structure through and through. —J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*.

Three Faces of Crippling



Birth Defects Arthritis Polio

JOIN THE
MARCH OF DIMES

TOWARD GREATER VICTORIES

Value of Odaxius' Translation of Cebes' *Tabula*

In his monograph on the MSS of Cebes' *Tabula*, Mueller includes a brief discussion¹ of the Latin translation of this work prepared by Ludovicus Odaxius and first published in Bologna in 1497. The conclusion reached by him is that the Odaxius version is based on a Greek text very similar to that found in codex Parisinus Graecus 1774 (= C), and hence has absolutely no critical value. K. Praechter makes use of Odaxius' translation in establishing his critical text,² but cites its readings on only some three occasions. Thus it may be said that, although students of Cebes have long been aware of the existence of the translation by Odaxius, they have consistently up to now regarded it as having relatively little importance for purposes of textual criticism. It is the purpose of this note to attempt to show that the Odaxius translation (subsequently designated O) has considerably greater critical value than has previously been assumed to be the case, and deserves to be cited in several additional instances in future critical editions.

My own comparison of O with the Greek MSS confirms Mueller's observation that O agrees more closely with C than with any other MS known to be in existence. The omission from O, however, of the material extending from $\nu\eta\ \Delta\iota\alpha$ (14.2.2) to $\nu\eta\ \Delta\iota\alpha$ (14.3.2) makes it almost certain that Odaxius translated from some MS other than C, since the text of C is intact at this point.³ In calling attention to this situation, Mueller, who bases his observations on the *editio princeps* of O, notes the possibility that the omission is due to an oversight on the part of Odaxius himself or the typesetters, rather than to a gap in the Greek source.⁴ Of considerable importance in this connection, however, is the fact that codex Riccardianus 766 contains (ff. 323^v-328^r) a handwritten copy of O which is almost certainly the copy on which the first printed edition was based.⁵ Several features in the Riccardianus codex lead to this conclusion, the most striking of which is the form of the marginal note on $\theta\upsilon\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ (10.1.2).

Theorizings on Mueller's Note

Mueller quotes the note in question as appearing in the *editio princeps* in the following form: *Graecus codex habet $\theta\upsilon\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ $\mu\iota\chi\rho\nu$ quod significat hostiolum. si vero $\mu\iota\chi\rho\nu$ $\theta\eta\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ recte est. bestiola: lector pensita.*⁶ The reader familiar only with the printed version may reasonably be somewhat puzzled by the pointless change of word order from noun-adjective to adjective-noun in the second Greek phrase. When one turns, however, to the same note in the Riccardianus codex, the situation is immediately clarified. It is obvious that the individual who copied the marginal note originally quoted only the words $\theta\upsilon\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\theta\eta\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$, adding $\mu\iota\chi\rho\nu$ in each case as an

afterthought. In the first instance he was able to accommodate the adjective within the lines already copied by inserting $\mu\iota$ after $\theta\upsilon\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ at the end of one line and crowding the remainder in at an angle at the beginning of the next line. In the second instance, however, no room could be found for the adjective in the original line; hence the word was inserted above the line, but to the right of $\theta\eta\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ as an indication that the scribe definitely intended for the adjective to follow the noun. By virtue of its superlinear position, however, the second $\mu\iota\chi\rho\nu$ appeared to the typesetter to comprise by itself an entire new line, and thus was placed in the wrong position, before $\theta\eta\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$, in the printed text.

Since it is fairly obvious from the characteristics of this note, as well as from other analogous peculiarities,⁷ that the Riccardianus codex was the source of the printed editions, and since the codex also shares the omission in 14.2-3 noted above, it follows that Mueller's assumption that the typesetter may have been responsible for the omission is no longer tenable. Moreover, the fact that Greek words and phrases from the text of the *Tabula* are inserted in the margins of the Riccardianus codex in at least two different hands suggests that the translation had been very carefully checked against the Greek text. Hence, if the omission had been due to an oversight on the part of Odaxius himself, there is every reason to believe the missing material would have been supplied by a corrector. It is reasonably certain, therefore, that the omission in the Latin text results from the fact that Odaxius used some Greek MS, now lost, which omitted the corresponding passage. Even though this MS was closely related to C, the fact that it apparently no longer exists renders O much more valuable than would otherwise be the case.

A considerable amount of accurate information about the exact wording of this MS is provided by the Greek words and phrases quoted in the margins of the Riccardianus MS and some of the earlier printed editions of O. Aside from Mueller's use of the note on $\theta\upsilon\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ quoted above, no one, so far as is known to me, has even taken cognizance of the existence of this evidence. While it is true that in most cases these marginal notes simply confirm readings which have already been well established on the basis of the testimony of all, or a substantial majority, of the other MSS, a few of them do provide some significant information. In 26.1.4, for instance, most MSS have a corrupt spelling of Κωρύκιον , with only R² and K showing the correct form.⁸ The presence of the word in its correct spelling in the margin of O indicates that the Greek MS of Odaxius may now be added to the limited group of MSS which are accurate at this point.

In explaining that under given conditions characters in his allegory enjoy immunity from the meta-

phorical stings of certain vices, Cebes compares such characters with a group designated in all MSS as οἱ ἐχιόδηκτοι (26.3.2). This reading is difficult to justify, and has been emended in a number of different ways by various editors. Odaxius, unfortunately, sheds no new light on the problem. It would naturally be assumed from the wording of his Latin translation—*qui a vipera morsi aliquando fuerint*—that he was using a MS which had the form ἐχιόδηκτοι found in all the known MSS. Definite confirmation of this assumption is provided by the fact that the marginal notes in *O* include this Greek word in exactly the form in which it appears in all the other MSS.⁹

Latin Text and Modern Emendations

In several instances the Latin text of *O* anticipates emendations by modern scholars. While it is possible that in some of these cases Odaxius himself engaged in conjecture, there are good reasons for believing that he may well have had at his disposal a Greek text which was better at the points in question than any of the MSS which have survived. It is significant that the Anonymous translation of Cebes' *Tabula* in Vat. Lat. 4037 (= *Anon.*)¹⁰ anticipates almost all of the same modern conjectures that are anticipated by *O*. Instances in question are the following οὕτω 26.3.5 (*Schweighäuser*) τούτους *W*², τοῦτο all other MSS, igitur *Anon.*, ita *O*; αὐτοῦ 32.4.1 (*Sauppeus*), αὐτῆς *P*, αὐτοῖς all other MSS, ubi (which in context implies same meaning as αὐτοῦ) *Anon.*, ibi *O*; βελτίους 33.6.5 (*Praechter*), omitted in all MSS, meliorem *Anon.*, meliores *O*; ἅμα μετὰ 41.3.3 (*Schweighäuser*), ἀλλὰ κατὰ *W*, ἀλλὰ μετὰ all other MSS, cum *O*.¹¹

It seems highly improbable that two translators working independently would present so many almost identical emendations of a text. At the same time, it can hardly be assumed that they were using the same Greek MS, since *Anon.* contains a complete text of the material in 14.2-3 omitted, as shown above, from the Greek source employed by Odaxius. Note has already been taken of the close affinity existing between *O* and *C*—the earliest extant member of the *CK(P)* family of MSS. I have pointed out elsewhere that *Anon.*, too, is based on a lost member of this same family, which appears to have maintained the readings of the archetype of the family more consistently than does *C* itself. As an instance, I suggested that, for reasons which need not be repeated here, the reading *hoc quidem video* (7.1.1) in *Anon.* points to the pronoun τοῦτο after ὁρῶ in the archetype of the family in place of the τοῦτον of *C*¹² and the τούτους of *C*² and the other families of MSS.¹² It is interesting to note that the reading of *O* at this point is *video . . . hoc*. It seems certain, therefore, that *Anon.* and *O* were based on

separate, but closely related, MSS, both of which were nearer to the archetype of the *CK(P)* family than any one of the extant members of that group. The instances quoted above in which the two Latin translations anticipate the same conjectures by modern scholars may very well represent cases in which the Greek sources of both had independently inherited good readings from the archetype of the family. In view of these circumstances it is obvious that credit for such readings should be given in future critical editions. Chauncey Edgar Finch
Saint Louis University

NOTES

- 1 Carolus Conradus Mueller, *De Arte Critica Cebetis Tabulae Adhibenda* (Virceburgi 1877) 71-74. 2 Carolus Praechter, *Cebetis Tabula* (Leipzig 1893) iv. 3 Another important distinction between *C* and *O* which must be taken into consideration is that, whereas *C* comes to an end in 40.2.2, *O*, like most of the other Greek MSS, carries the text through 41.4.1. Hence, if it is to be argued that Odaxius used *C* itself as his source, it must obviously be assumed that he had access to some other MS from which he supplied the additional material from 40.2.2, through 41.4.1. 4 Mueller, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 1) 72. 5 The author wishes to express his gratitude to Berta Maracchi of Biblioteca Riccardiana for making available to him a microfilm copy of Ricc. 766. 6 Mueller, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 1) 71. 7 The author has not seen a copy of the *editio princeps*. Through the courtesy, however, of the Directors of the *Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University* he has access to a microfilm of a copy of the 1515 Paris edition marked *ab Ioanne Paruo et Iodoco Badio*, bound into codex Reg. Lt. 274 as ff. 91^v-94^r. This edition, which appears to be based on the *editio princeps*, has the same form of the note on ὁρῶν as is quoted by Mueller. In its margin there appears opposite the translation of Ἀληθία (9.1.6) the entry ἀληθία (doubtless taken directly from the *editio princeps*). The reason for the faulty spelling becomes clear when one examines the Riccardianus codex. The scribe obviously wrote ἀληθία, but the second vertical stroke of π has been almost completely obliterated, with the result that the portion of the letter which remains visible resembles a τ. Opposite the translation of Τιμωρία (10.2.3) appears the entry τιμωρία in the margin of the 1515 edition. Again, an examination of the Riccardianus MS shows clearly what has happened. To one familiar with the Greek text it is clear that the scribe wrote τιμωρία. The second loop of ω is almost closed at the top, however, and the first loop is so faintly joined to the second as to give to the typesetter the impression that the scribe had wanted to write τιμωρία. 8 Praechter is in error in listing *F* in his *apparatus* as among the MSS with the correct spelling. An examination of a microfilm copy of *F* reveals that it, like a majority of the other MSS, has κωρύκειον. 9 Other Greek entries in the margins of *O* which are of special interest are τῶνος οὗτος βίος (4.2.5), which indicates that the source of *O* agreed with a majority of the MSS against *A* in its word order at this point; πλανή (5.3.2), but πλανος (23.1.3) in agreement in gender with a majority of the other MSS in both cases. The rest of the some 50 entries in the margin are in complete agreement with the consensus of other MSS, and hence are of no great importance for textual purposes. 10 Chauncey E. Finch, "The Translation of Cebes' *Tabula* in Codex Vaticanus Latinus 4037," *TAPA* 85 (1954) 79-87. 11 No reading can be cited for *Anon.*, since this portion of the work is omitted in its text. 12 Finch, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 10) 83.

The cult of Ciceronianism established by Quintilian is the real origin of the collection of Pliny's *Letters*. Cicero and Pliny had many weaknesses and some virtues in common, and the desire of emulating Cicero, which Pliny openly and repeatedly expresses, had a considerable effect in exaggerating his weaknesses.—J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*.

Meanings of *Res* in the *De Rerum Natura*

The theme of the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius is the universe, explained on the atomic principles propounded by the Greek atomists, and borrowed by Epicurus to form the physical side of his philosophy; and though Quintilian says that Lucretius is *difficilis*, it is not his thinking that causes difficulty, for that is quite clear, but his expression.¹ Because of the *patrii sermonis egestas*, Lucretius, dealing with a technical subject, solved his problem by creating for himself a technical vocabulary. The word *res*, the subject of this study, is one of four words, the other three being *corpus*, *ratio*, *natura*, which occur with great frequency and with great variety of meanings. As Disandro² says, "No hay ninguna palabra que tenga tanta vida diversa en el poema como *res*. . . ." And Munro endorses this idea with his comment "the little word *res* is made to perform a legion of functions."³ Lucretius himself seems to delight in the multiplicity and diversity of usage; frequently he uses the word twice in one line in different grammatical structures and with wholly divergent meanings: in 1.690-691 he uses *res*, *rem*, *rerum*; in 1.893-897 he uses *res* five times in four verses, and in 1.812-816, six times in four verses, with an outstanding antithetical and alliterative form of the whole sentence:

Adiutamur enim dubio procul atque alimur nos
certis ab *rebus*, certis aliae atque aliae *res*,
nimirum quia multa modis communia multis
multarum *rerum* in *rebus* primordia mixta
sunt, ideo variis variae *res* *rebus* aluntur.

For we ourselves are helped without doubt and nourished by certain fixed things; other things and others again by other fixed things; undoubtedly because many first-beginnings common to many things in many ways are commingled in things, therefore different things are nourished by different things.⁴

We must note, however, that Lucretius' use of the word is not due to a lack of clearness in his thinking nor paucity of expression, for there are passages of a hundred verses or more where *res* is not used at all.⁵

With Lucretius, the word has many abstract meanings, but as a physical term it signifies composite things in being, in contra-distinction to the *primordia* or *corpora prima* out of which things are made. Or, as Disandro explains it: "deux concepts de *natura naturans* et *natura naturata* qui se retrouve dans le titre de l'oeuvre, où *natura* exprime le premier, *rerum* le second."⁶

The etymology of the word does not offer much aid in determining a precise meaning. Most scholars prefer the Sanskrit *rah* or *rai-h*, meaning "riches, possessions," though *ῥῆμα* from *ῥέω*, "that about which we are talking," has been suggested.⁷ Ernout elaborates his discussion by adding "désignant des biens concrets, *res* a pu servir à exprimer ce qui existe, la chose, 'la réalité.'" But whatever its derivation, in the work of Lucretius, the word has ac-

quired a diversity of meaning that provides for the reader a challenge of interpretation.

Three Divisions of Meanings

At the risk of over-simplifying the problem, it might be said that Lucretius' use of the word *res* falls into three general divisions: (1) composite things, made up of matter and void; (2) periphrases with special technical meanings, for example, *natura rerum*, *summa rerum*; and (3) the comfortably indefinite "things" which can run the gamut of ideas, such as truth, reality, the subject at hand. This grouping is convenient, but not altogether precise, since there is great dissimilarity of meanings in each of these groups.

With by far the greatest frequency the word *res* is used in its technical sense, to express composite, created things, things made up of matter and void. Quite frequently, also, the word is limited or embellished by a modifier: a particular thing, certain things, soft things, tender things, fixed things, many things, created things, mixed things, hidden things, visible things. This descriptive quality prevents monotony from marring the beauty of the poem, and adds to the greater clearness of the picture that Lucretius is offering to his readers. In its negative aspect, Lucretius uses *res* with a negative for "no created thing," and also for "nothing," that is, absence of being. In 1.471 he uses the expression *materies . . . rerum nulla* to mean "no material thing," thereby excluding both persons and places, all the concrete elements which go to make an event.⁸ In 2.185 *nullam rem* meaning "not a single thing" is a very emphatic substitute for *nihil*. In 1.420 he uses *res* (*duabus rebus*) to refer to "void," a usage which Merrill⁹ asserts is *propter egestatem linguae*. In 1.346 Lucretius deviates from his idea of *res* as things composed of matter and void, and speaks of *solidae res* to indicate things absolutely compact, with no void in them. Munro comments that "all *res* or things in being are *rarae*, that is have a mixture of void in them."¹¹

Periphrases with Technical Meaning

On examining the periphrases containing *res*, one finds still greater variety. For the meaning of *natura rerum* Katharine Reiley¹² suggests simply "the sum of things in being," and in 1.710 it is generally agreed that *rerum naturas omnis* is simply a circumlocution for *res*. In the title of the poem, *rerum natura* indicates all phenomena of creation, in the widest sense, "the first object of the working power and the reason for its working."¹³ Sometimes the expression means the whole "visible and physical world, or parts thereof."¹⁴ Munro, in the same passage, says that *natura rerum* is coextensive with the

(Continued on page 31)

The Classical Bulletin

Published by the Department of Classical Languages
at Saint Louis University

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

William Charles Korfmacher.....	Editor
Chauncey Edgar Finch.....	Associate Editor
Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Claude Herman Heithaus, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Francis Charles Hunleth, S.J.....	Associate Editor

Address: 221 North Grand Boulevard, Saint Louis 3, Missouri
Subscription: \$2.00 per year. Single copies: 40c. To members of the ACL, CAAS, CAMWS, CANE, and CAPS, \$1.60 per year through the Office of the Secretary-Treasurer of each of these organizations.

Concerning subscriptions, renewals, books, pamphlets, advertising, and the like, please address the Editor. Concerning manuscripts for possible publication, address any member of the Committee.

Volume 35 January 1959 Number 3

E D I T O R I A L

Foreign Languages for the Doctorate

The traditional "reading knowledge of French and German" imposed as a requirement upon all candidates for the doctorate in American universities has long been under fire. In many instances it has frankly been given up; in others it has allowed a substitution of languages other than the original pair; in still others it has remained on the books in graduate catalogues but in practice has been subject to evasion, alteration, and interpretation "in specific cases."

Now it is altogether obvious that the original establishment of the requirement as a tool of research came at a time when the doctorate was being conferred in far fewer disciplines than today, and when a great bulk of the research and reference work in those same disciplines was in French and German. Proponents of change today point out that in certain fields the notable tool materials are all in English; or that, if foreign tongues are concerned, they may be Russian, Spanish or Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, or one of the many hitherto exotic languages of the Middle East or the far Orient. On the other hand, dissidents are quick to point out the sad fact that many candidates defer such foreign language study (especially French and German) until the very eve of graduation, when they do short, intensive preparation, slip through the required examinations, and vow sincerely never to look at the language again.

Quite clearly, of course, there is nothing sacrosanct about the specific tongues French and German. Substitutes are not alone in order but should be encouraged and required where the "tool" concept is in place. And if one or other foreign language is actually a "tool" in a given field, it rests with the

faculty of that field to require a use of the tool during the actual progress of graduate instruction and the actual composition of the dissertation.

But in the present orientation of thoughts about the doctorate, it is being happily pointed out that the *instrumental* need of one or more foreign languages (and notable here is the implication that one may be sufficient) is not the sole and controlling reason for the requirement. A doctor of philosophy is thought of as something more than a trained technician. Whatever his field, he should be a man of vision and taste, broadly and liberally trained. There is a deep *cultural* need for at least one foreign language, to rescue the holder of the doctorate from the possible narrowness of outlook associated with a knowledge of the native tongue only.

This is a position fully tenable for the doctorate in any conceivable discipline. But it appears most amply for the doctorate in the humanities. Those favoring the *cultural* aspect of the requirement have maintained further that their purposes would be met with a single foreign tongue, but only if the foreign language chosen were mastered *in depth*—that is, if the language *and literature* were to a reasonable degree actually mastered. The ramifications of this concept are widespread and are fully harmonious with the present trend in collegiate, secondary, and even primary education to emphasize foreign language study and to emphasize the mastery of at least one such language. It is clear, too, that as cultural subjects classical Greek and Latin, as well as the Romance, Germanic, and Slavic tongues, would claim a place in many doctoral programs.

Within a few years, we may expect entrants to the graduate schools to be better prepared linguistically than they are now and will be in the immediate future. The attainment of mastery in a foreign language and literature will be difficult—but not impossible—to work out. Language departments may expect, perhaps, to provide "unrelated save culturally" minors to majors of all sorts. They may be expected, too, to relax in such cases their own heavy traditional prerequisite requirements. If graduate credit can be given for basic courses in Sanskrit, for example, or in the other less familiar ancient and even contemporary tongues, why could not special "graduate" courses be set up in basic ancient Greek and Latin, and in the familiar French, German, and Italian? This would be a realistic reaction, likely to be welcome to students plagued by the pervasive "credit" enumeration in the American system.

In all of this thinking, too, the "tool" concept in one or more foreign languages is not lost—for surely the holder of the doctorate with the mastery of one foreign language and literature can be expected to use that possession for his research needs as well as to enjoy it for the widened mental horizon it affords.

—W. C. K.

Vergil's Seventh Ecloga (Translated)

Meliboeus:

Daphnis was sitting near a garrulous oak,
When Thyrsis drove his she-goats, udders full
Of rich milk, toward the sheep in Corydon's fold:
Arcadian shepherds, garlanded with youth,
Equal as poets, ready in reply.
Hither (I was transplanting myrtle shoots)
My flock's bellwether wandered, and Daphnis
I see; noticing my approach, he says,
"Meliboeus, come speedily! your goats
Are here safe, and your ram; rest in the shade
If you can leave your work. Here bullocks come
To drink, down through the meadow, where Mincius
With green reeds builds his roof against the shore,
And the holy hymn of bees sounds from this oak."
What could I do? Alcippe none, nor Phyllis
Had I to fold the new-weaned lambs to home,
But the contest, Thyrsis against Corydon. . .
Oh nonetheless, I'd put my work aside;
Then they began to parry, each of them
Alternate verses which the Muse inspired—
First Corydon; and Thyrsis then replied:

Corydon:

Oh nymphs, our lovers, now some fine song deign,
As Codrus gained of you; the songs he sang
Were on Apollo's model, of his strain:
If I cannot thus sing, then shall I hang
My flute upon this tree, there to remain.

Thyrsis:

With ivy now a poet's forehead wreath,
Let Codrus' sides as though with envy burst;
Or if such praise will make all others seethe
Plait me a charm, that I be not accursed,
And may despite them all my songs bequeath.

Corydon:

To thee, Diana, thy poor Micon sent
A bristling boar's head, and an antlered deer;
If this song please thee, then, please thou assent
That in smooth marble statues thou stand here
Lifelike, in huntress's habiliment.

Thyrsis:

My bowls of milk and the libation wine
That I have poured, Priapus, out for thee,
Should be enough, thou scarecrow half-divine.
Of marble are you now; fertility
Granted our flocks, a golden statue's thine.

Corydon:

Oh Thetis, sweeter to me art thou than thyme,
Brighter art thou than a swan, and fresher too
Than freshest ivy. Beasts in the eveningtime
Seek out their mangers, but a poet seeks you:
If you have care of me, answer my rhyme.

Thyrsis:

O may I seem worse than a butcher's broom,
Worse than a poisoned herb, and much more vile
Than beaches cluttered with old seaweed bloom,
If this one day seems not a longer while
Than a whole year. Come now, my flock, come home.

Corydon:

The springs, the herbs that more than sleep do please,
The spreading trees that cast their dappled shade—
May these the flocks of summer grant some ease.
The long hot days come on, and in the glade
Now, ripening fruit hangs in the happy trees.

Thyrsis:

Here are the torches, here the ingle, here
Is always a roaring fire, whose pungent smoke
Blackens the doorpost; the declining year
Frightens us with its cold, as can the flock
Affright the wolf, or banks make floodtide fear.

Corydon:

The rugged chestnut and the juniper now stand,
And apples in the grass in strewn profusion lie;
Joyful is all now, all in the peaceful land
Laughs, but if the cooling breezes sigh
Away from the hills, the rivers will run sand.

Thyrsis:

The fields are burning, and the dying grain
Thirsts in the thirsty air; the green hills' shade
Is envied of Bacchus: Phyllis must come again
To give back green to all the dying glade,
And Jupiter will come in droves of rain.

Corydon:

The vine is dear to Bacchus, Hercules
The poplar loves, Venus her myrtle, and
Phoebus his laurel; but the hazels, these
Does Phyllis love, and while her love shall stand
Not any of theirs shall conquer hazel trees.

Thyrsis:

In woodland stands the handsome ash; the pine
Graces a garden; poplars line the brook,
The fir tree guards the hills;—Lycida mine,
More often upon me turn thy matchless look
And all these trees shall add their fame to thine.

Meliboeus:

—This I recall; and Thyrsis vainly strove,
For Corydon did then the victor prove.

Alfred Nonny

Saint Louis University

Meanings of Res

(Continued from page 29)

summa rerum, comprehending the infinity of worlds in being throughout the *omne*, and denoting sometimes this *summa* itself, sometimes that universally pervading agency by which the *summa* goes on.¹⁵

Equally vague is the expression *summa rerum*. Here again, Reiley offers a simple meaning, "this world of ours,"¹⁶ which, however, is not quite adequate under all circumstances. In contrast, Cyril Bailey, in his commentary on 1.235 says:

. . . *rerum summa* is regularly used in four different senses which merge into one another and cannot always be sharply distinguished. (1) In accordance with Lucretius' normal use of *res* to denote concrete things, i.e. atomic compounds, *rerum summa* should strictly mean 'the sum total of created things'; this sense it has in 502, 756. . . (2) But since as Munro points out, *primordia* are constantly passing into things and things into *primordia*, it is impossible to maintain the distinction between them, and so *rerum summa* comes to mean 'the totality of matter,' as in 619, 635, 1008. . . (3) Finally, *rerum summa* acquires the still vaguer and wider meaning of 'the universe,' i.e., the sum total of matter and void, which it has in 333. (4) *Rerum summa* is also used in the narrower sense of 'the world' (*mundus*) which is usually expressed by *haec rerum summa*. Besides these four main uses, Lucretius has others with *summa* alone and in combination with other words.¹⁷

In 1.619, however, *rerum summam* is almost a play on words; it means the universe of things, and at the same time the largest thing conceivable in opposition to *minimam*.¹⁸ Merrill, noting the term, states that it is "not *summa corpora* simply, but the world with its supply of atoms, whether forming bodies or not."¹⁹ Thus we see that Lucretius sometimes speaks of the *summa rerum* as both "things in being" and "atoms from which they come."

Usually, however, Lucretius uses the expression *primordia rerum* for the latter idea. In 1.55 he states that this is his proper and distinctive term for the atoms or first elements of things, though he frequently uses *corpora*, *corpora rerum*, and *semina rerum* as synonyms. Lucretius also uses the expression to distinguish between simple and compound

elements of bodies.²⁰ Bindseil offers an ingenious explanation that Lucretius rejected *atomos* and chose *primordia* as his technical term because the term *primordia* suggested more clearly atomic function, namely, to be the begetting elements of the *res*.²¹ The use of *semina rerum* in the strictly atomic sense occurs in 1.176, 2.678, 5.916; elsewhere its usage is more general, meaning "seeds," "nuclei," or "germs from which things spring." In addition to *semina rerum* we find the term *materiem rerum* expressing the primal element, also *genitalia corpora rebus* and *vitalia rerum*, the particles which by their union create things.

One further periphrasis is *res in quo quaeque geruntur*, meaning, usually infinite space.²² But this expression also has variations implying sometimes the creative activity resulting from the collision of atoms, and sometimes the occurrence of events. In 1.988 the term includes not only the notions and actions of created things, but also the preliminary motions and unions of the atoms which create them. Brieger, however, takes it in the narrower sense of the actions of created things.²³ In 2.1069 *geri debent . . . et confieri res*, *res* is used slightly differently with the two verbs: processes must be carried on and compound things created.²⁴ Besides those previously mentioned, the expression *esse in rebus* is also found frequently as a circumlocution for "to exist."

The Indefinite "Things"

In regard to the third group, the vague, general uses of the word *res*, there is so great diversity as to be almost distinct in each case. The expression "*illud in his rebus*," which occurs sixteen times, however, has approximately the same usage each time. "*Cette tournure semble particulière à Lucrèce et lui sert le plus souvent à prévenir une objection, ou à introduire une réfutation; quelquefois encore à amener le développement d'un point particulier dans un développement d'ordre général.*"²⁵ In 1.43 and 1.408 there occurs the expression *talibus in rebus*, in the first instance meaning "amid such doings,"²⁶ and in the second, "in such cases as the present."²⁷ In 1.27 *omnibus . . . rebus* perhaps refers to Memmius' offices or to his personal graces.²⁸ In 5.1141 *res redibat*, according to most commentators, refers to the government of the state.²⁹ In 1.172 *hac re* appears, formed on the model of *quare* and used adverbially, "therefore," as is the expression *quas ob res* in 1.155, formed from *quam ob rem*, which occurs very frequently in the work. In 1.157 *res quaeque* is probably not "each individual thing," but "each class of thing," a usage which occurs throughout the six books. "According to Giussani's view it will mean 'each species of thing.' . . . On Pascal's view it means 'each individual thing.' . . . This is the more natural meaning of *res quaeque* as in 218, 383, and many other places. Probably Lucretius had both

meanings in mind."³⁰ *Inane rerum* and *in rebus inane* refer to "things in being," the "void contained in things."

Lucretius also uses the word *res* quite frequently to refer to what he has just said or is going to say: in 1.265, *res quoniam docui* is explained by Cyril Bailey as Lucretius' regular habit to sum up what he has already proved before going on to a new point, especially in the introduction to the later books.³¹ We also find such expressions as *rerum novitatem*, "newness of themes," in *multis rebus*, "in many respects," "the problem"; in *his rebus*, "while we are on this topic," "in this regard," "from the subject"; *de magnis rebus*, "about great matters," "the theory itself"; and *res* alone to indicate "meaning," "suggestion," "fact," "reality." Sometimes the use of *res* is equivalent to *vis*, and *rerum novarum* appears sometimes in its political usage of "revolution," and sometimes, as in 6.646, it seems to do double duty, meaning both revolution and the newly created things. In 1.416, *de quavis una re* can best be rendered "in regard to any single aspect of the problem." *Rebus opima bonis* (1.728) refers to natural products, and in 1.674 *copia rerum*, the abundance of natural products. *Res* is frequently used as a substitute for *simulacra* or in connection with it, referring to "images" or "idols," *εἰδωλα*, which are shed from all things, not the bloodless phantoms which Ennius imagines to issue out of Acheron and which terrify us when sick or asleep.³² And, finally, in 1.1117 *res* seems to refer to the "knowledge of things."

In a study of the English renditions of the word in its many usages, it is interesting to note the ingenuity of the translators in their attempts to avoid repetitious monotony. Of all those whose works were compared in this study, Munro shows the greatest versatility and flexibility in his choice of words, with Rouse following a close second. The latter frequently avoids the necessity of translating "things" by recasting the sentence, and he does this so skillfully that the text suffers no loss of meaning or clearness.

Thus we see that Lucretius triumphs over his *patrii sermonis egestas* and brings to his readers a clear, enthusiastic, highly poetical exposition of the atomic theory. In clearness and eloquence he excels his master, Epicurus, many times over,³³ his command of language enabling him to be interesting and lucid, even when explaining dry and abstruse matters. This is one reason for the great merit of his work. The other is the poet's own genius.³⁴ "Zu der Hoheit des Lucrez wird man unwillkürlich hingezogen und sich gern die Worte Vergils ins Gedächtnis zurückrufen (georg. 2.490): *felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis avari.*"³⁵ Sister M. Renelle Ojeman, S.S.N.D. Notre Dame College (Saint Louis)

1 J. W.
1910) 281
(La Plati
Rerum N
ferred to
De Rerum
; Cf. 5.5
A. Disan
rista de l
Marouzea
lateinisch
e. v. res
(Paris 19
Lexicon
res. 9 C
(Oxford
"Bailey")
Natura L
hereafter
C. Bailey
ius and
after as
Bailey, a
Barney S
(Madison
also 1.25
many ot
18 Munr
ad 1.493
1.995. 2
and Smi
Leon Ro
l ad 180
370; 4.2
1230. 26
Leonard
Leonard
interesti
1.562. 3
Bailey, 7
279. H.
1936) 12
der röm

Green

Excer
Associat
chairman
"We h
of Engli
sture th
tion. Th
research
should e
strument
"It is
ing know
should b
therefor
or three
language
French,
"The
particul
in the f
In view
and the
ical lite
that gra
steps to
support
graduat
students
Course
uate cre
credit fo
to the p
some fa
"We
on forei
ment of
guages

NOTES

1 J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*² (London 1910) 281-300. 2 Carlos A. Disandro, *La Poesía de Lucrecio* (La Plata 1950) 2.6. 3 H. A. J. Munro, *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (London 1873) II ad 6.1105. (Referred to hereafter as "Munro"). 4 W. H. D. Rouse, *Lucretius De Rerum Natura* (Loeb Classical Library 1924) ad locum. 5 Cf. 5.545-666, 679-830; 6.1105-1213, and others. 6 Carlos A. Disandro, "Natura y De Rerum Natura en Lucrecio," *Revista de Estudios Clasicos* 3 (1948) 227-244; summarized by Marouzeau in *L'Année Philologique* (1949). 7 Alois Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1910) s. v. res; Alfred Ernout, *Morphologie historique du latin* (Paris 1945) s. v. res. 8 Aegidii Forcellini, *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon* (Prati 1871) s. v. res; *Harper's Latin Dictionary*, s. v. res. 9 Cyril Bailey, *Lucreti De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (Oxford 1947) II-III ad locum. (Referred to hereafter as "Bailey"). 10 William A. Merrill, *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (New York 1907) ad locum. (Referred to hereafter as "Merrill"). 11 Munro, ad locum. 12 Katharine C. Reiley, *Studies in the Philosophical Terminology of Lucretius and Cicero* (New York 1909) 122. (Referred to hereafter as "Reiley"). 13 Merrill, ad locum. 14 Munro, ad 1.25; Bailey, ad 2.530. 15 William Ellery Leonard and Stanley Barney Smith, *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (Madison 1942) in 5.54 use *rerum naturam* in this sense; cf. also 1.25; 2.75; 5.368, and Bailey, 1.1008; 2.303; 6.649; also many others. 16 Reiley, 122. 17 Bailey, II ad locum. 18 Munro, ad locum. 19 Merrill, ad 1.1008. 20 Merrill, ad 1.493. 21 Reiley, 50. 22 Ibid. 116. 23 Bailey, I ad 1.995. 24 Ibid., ad 2.1069. See also comment by Leonard and Smith, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 15). 25 Alfred Ernout and Leon Robin, *Lucrèce de rerum natura I-III* (Paris 1925) I ad 180. Cf. also ad 1.370; 2.216, 308, 581; II ad 3.319, 570; 4.256, 777, 823, 898; III ad 5.247, 666, 1091; 6.1056, 1230. 26 Munro, ad locum. 27 Merrill, ad locum. 28 Leonard and Smith, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 15) ad locum. 29 Leonard and Smith, Merrill, Ernout and Robin, all have very interesting comments on this passage. 30 Bailey, II ad 1.562. 31 Ibid., ad locum. 32 Munro, ad locum. 33 Cyril Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus* (Oxford 1928) 275-279. H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Latin Literature* (London 1906) 128. 35 Martin Schanz and Carl Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (Munich 1927) I 279.

one member who is really at home with Greek literature in the original, another with German, a third with French, and a fourth with Italian.

"Our continued reiteration of the importance of foreign language studies in high schools and colleges will neither have nor deserve a serious hearing until we demonstrate by our practice on the graduate school level that competence in foreign language and literature is essential to the humanist and scholar."

Raymond Victor Schoder, S.J.

West Baden College,
West Baden Springs, Indiana

Smoke-screens in Ancient Warfare

In World War II, General Rommel made extensive use of dust-warfare in his North African campaigns. That the ancient Greeks and Romans were fully acquainted with this type of warfare was brought out by Edward Echols, in an interesting study entitled "Military Dust" (*CJ* 47 [1952] 285-288). Similarly, the ancients were acquainted with the smoke-screen. Several examples of its employment came to my attention in a recent perusal of Polyaeus' *Strategemata*, and, as a result, it appeared to me to be worth while to set down the following passages:

"When Epaminondas was halting at the foot of a bridge over the river Spercheus, facing the Thessalians, he observed toward morning that a heavy fog was rising from the river. He ordered each company of soldiers to heap up two piles of wood, the one green, and the other dry. Toward midnight he ordered that the green timbers be placed on top of the dry ones, and that the bottom of the pile be set on fire. The night, the fog, and the smoke created a dense darkness, which enabled Epaminondas to lead his troops across the bridge without the knowledge of the enemy" (2.3).

"Iphicrates once employed this same stratagem to an even greater advantage. Although the enemy was encamped opposite him, he advanced a three-days' march without being observed. He, too, built fires of dry wood, and then heaped greenwood upon the blaze. The dense smoke which arose obscured the movements of his army from the eyes of the enemy" (3.9.7).

"On another occasion, Iphicrates again made clever use of a smoke-screen. While opposing his enemies in Thrace, he set fire to a grove which separated the two armies, and abandoned his animals and baggage in camp. When the smoke intensified the blackness of the night, he led off his troops to a place dense with growth and darkness. When the Thracians approached next day and found the camp abandoned, they scattered for the sake of plunder. At this point Iphicrates reappeared with his army, defeated the Thracians, and recovered his baggage train" (3.9.41).

"Himilco once employed smoke not as a screen, but as a deceptive signal. Outside the walls of Agrigentum he divided his army into two parts. When the defenders of the city marched out with a large force, one portion of Himilco's army began a gradual retreat, and lured the defending army to a considerable distance from the city. Now Himilco ordered fires to be lit at the base of the city-walls, whereupon he led his portion of the troops into an ambush. When the soldiers of Agrigentum saw the smoke rising, they thought that the townspeople were recalling them, and so they turned about. They were now pursued and harried by the very troops they had been pursuing. When they approached the ambush, Himilco and his troops suddenly appeared, killing some of them and capturing the rest" (5.10.4).

"Pelopidas once employed smoke to great advantage. He was besieging two fortresses, which were about one hundred and twenty stadia distant from each other. As he approached one of these fortresses, he was met, by prearrangement, by four riders, bedecked with garlands, and bearing a report that the other fortress had already been captured. At once Pelopidas turned toward the supposedly captured city, where he ordered great piles of logs to be set on fire outside the city-walls. The smoke gave the impression of a burning city. When the defenders of the first city saw the smoke, they became panic-stricken and surrendered to Pelopidas without a struggle" (2.4.1).

The foregoing examples show how clever the ancients were. Polyaeus (second century A.D.) is by no means a great writer, nor a reliable one, but he has collected a great many anecdotes which bear eloquent testimony to the resourcefulness of the ancient military commanders.

Alfred P. Dorjahn

Northwestern University

Breviora

Greek Studies for English Doctoral Candidates

Excerpts from a Committee Report of the *College English Association*, June 1957, by Alvan S. Ryan as Committee chairman:

"We hold that it is wiser to try to increase the competence of English graduate students in foreign language and literature than to add extensive work in the classics in translation. The foreign language reading requirement as a 'tool of research' has become perfunctory and mechanical. . . . We should extend the Ph.D. requirement beyond the merely instrumental.

"It is the view of this committee that a constantly deepening knowledge of at least one foreign language and literature should be the mark of a humane scholar in English. . . . We therefore recommend that for the usual requirement of two or three languages be substituted the requirement of one language and literature. Generally it will be Greek, Latin, French, or German. . . .

"The committee considers that English departments, and particularly the graduate schools, have been culpably passive in the face of the steady decline of Greek and Latin studies. In view of the present revival of the classics in translation, and the almost universally acknowledged importance of classical literature to the student of English literature, we urge that graduate schools of English take definite and immediate steps to encourage classical language study. . . . There is support of this in the present practice of some of the leading graduate programs in English. In one of these, graduate students in English may enroll in an intensive Beginners' Course which meets five times a week, but do not receive graduate credit. In other universities, students receive graduate credit for beginning Greek, provided they continue their study to the point where they are able to read Homer or Plato with some facility.

"We wish to increase rather than diminish the emphasis on foreign languages. . . . Instead of having a whole department of Ph.D.'s with a hypothetical knowledge of three languages which seldom come to performance, there might be

Mary Isabel Sibley Fellowship

The Mary Isabel Sibley Fellowship is awarded alternately in the fields of Greek and French. Both fields are broadly interpreted—the Fellowship may be used for the study of Greek language, literature, history, or archaeology, or for the study of any aspect of French language or literature. The award is made annually and has a stipend of \$2,500. The stipend will be paid one-half upon demand after June 1 next following the award; and the balance upon demand after six months have expired, unless the Fellowship Committee orders it withheld on the ground that the Fellow has disregarded the purpose of the award as stated by the donor. Since the most recent award was offered for study in the field of French, only candidates who are interested in pursuing study in Greek language, literature, history, or archaeology are eligible for the award in the next academic year (1959). Applications for the 1959 award in Greek must be filed before February 1, 1959.

Candidates must be unmarried women between 25 and 35 years of age who have demonstrated their ability to carry on original research. While the doctor's degree is not a requirement, only those doctoral candidates will be considered who have completed "course" or "residence" requirements and expect to devote full-time work to research.

The Fellow shall file an informal report with the Committee at the completion of six months of work and a detailed report at the end of the year upon the completion of the research. Periodic reports of progress will also be welcomed. It is the hope of the Committee that the result of the year of research will be made available in some form, though no pressure for publication will be put upon the recipient of the Fellowship.

The Fellowship committee is composed of the following: Walter R. Agard, *chairman*, professor of classics, University of Wisconsin; Malcolm D. Daggett, professor of Romance languages, University of Vermont; Herbert N. Couch, professor of classics, Brown University.

All communications, including requests for application forms, should be addressed to the Mary Isabel Sibley Fellowship Committee, The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, 181 Q Street, N.W., Washington 9, D. C.

Secretary,
Phi Beta Kappa

Carl Billman

Eta Sigma Phi Contests for 1959

For 1958-1959, Eta Sigma Phi, national undergraduate honorary classical fraternity, announces the following *three Contests*. Further information may be had from the Chairman of Contests, W. C. Korfmacher, Saint Louis University, 221 North Grand Boulevard, Saint Louis 3, Missouri.

1) Fourteenth Annual Essay Contest:

(a) *Subject*: "Solon after Twenty-six Centuries." Solon's conventional date, about 640 B.C., makes 1960 the 2600th anniversary of his birth. He has been called at times "the father of Western democracy." How notably are his thoughts and his political ideas influential after the lapse of centuries? To what extent are democratic societies today in his debt? Why should we recall him especially in 1960? See among other references: "Anniversaries for Classicists," *The Classical World* 51 (April 1958) 183-185.

(b) *Eligibility*: The Contest is open to college undergraduates, enrolled at the time of submission of the paper in a course of Greek or Latin in an approved college or university in the United States or Canada.

(c) *Identification*: Each paper submitted is to be accompanied by an *identification page*, available in advance from the Chairman of Contests, giving necessary information and including a testimonial from a member of the classics faculty at the contestant's school as to the contestant's right to participate and his fair and original preparation of the paper. There is a limit of *three papers* from any one school.

(d) *Qualifications*: All papers must be original. Sincerity, definiteness, and originality will be especially considered. Quotations must be duly credited. Format, mode of citation, and the like, must be uniform within the paper. Entries must be typewritten, in double space, on one side only of normal-sized typewriter paper. The maximum length is 2,250 words.

(e) *Dates*: Written notice of a desire to participate, postmarked not later than February 2, 1959, must be sent to the Chairman of Contests. Entries themselves, similarly sent, must be postmarked not later than February 16, 1959.

(f) *Decision*: Decision as to place will be made by an expert judge, who will identify the papers by code designation only.

(g) *Prizes*: First, \$50.00; second, \$35.00; third, \$25.00; fourth, \$17.50; fifth, \$12.50; sixth, \$10.00. For its full award, the Contest will require a minimum of fifteen entries, from fifteen different schools.

2) Tenth Annual Greek Translation Contest:

(a) *Content*: The Contest will consist in the sight translation of a passage in Greek chosen with an eye to students in the second year of the language or above. Translations will be written in a two-hour period, under normal examination regulations, in each contestant's own school.

(b) *Eligibility*: The Contest is open to college undergraduates, enrolled at the time of participation in a course in Greek language in an approved college or university in the United States or Canada.

(c) *Identification*: Each paper submitted is to be accompanied by an *identification page*, as in the Essay Contest. There is a limit of *three papers* from any one school.

(d) *Dates*: Written notice of a desire to participate, postmarked not later than February 2, 1959, must be sent to the Chairman of Contests, who will mail the Contest material in time for the contest day. The Contest will be administered simultaneously in all the participating schools on February 12, 1959. Entries themselves, addressed to the Chairman of Contests, must be postmarked not later than February 16, 1959.

(e) *Decision*: Decision as to place will be made by an expert judge, who will identify the papers by code designation only.

(f) *Prizes*: Six prizes will be offered, as in the Essay Contest, *except* that any participant placing in *both* events will receive an *added* award equal to what he wins in the Greek Translation Contest. For its full award, the Contest will require a minimum of fifteen entries, from fifteen different schools.

3) Ninth Annual Satterfield Latin Translation Contest:

(a) *Content*: The Contest will consist in the original translation of a passage in Latin to be supplied on request by the Chairman of Contests. Translations will be written as normal "out-of-class" work, *not* as examinations.

(b) *Eligibility*: The Contest is open to college undergraduates, enrolled at the time of participation in an approved college or university in the United States or Canada.

(c) *Identification*: Each paper submitted is to be accompanied by an *identification page*, as in the Essay Contest. There is a limit of *three papers* from any one school.

(d) *Dates*: Written notice of a desire to participate, postmarked not later than February 2, 1959, must be sent to the Chairman of Contests, who will mail the Contest material in ample time for the closing date. Entries themselves similarly sent, must be postmarked not later than February 16, 1959.

(e) *Decision*: Decision as to place will be made by an expert judge, who will identify the papers by code designation only.

(f) *Prizes*: A prize of \$25.00 will be given for the best paper; \$15.00 for the second best, and \$10.00 for the third best.

The Little Woman

Radio and TV commentators, advertisers, and others frequently refer to one's wife or mother as "the little woman." She may be 5' 10", but she's still "the little woman." Could it be one of them knows his Cicero? In the Verrine oration *De Signis* 47, Cicero speaks of the grief caused to the housewives by Verres' stealing all their *patellae, paterae, turibula*. And he says: *Quae forsitan vobis parvae esse videantur, sed magnum et acerbum dolorem commovent, "mulierculis" praesertim . . .* Yes, such thefts may seem inconsequential but not to "the little women"!

D. Herbert Abel

Loyola University (Chicago)

If his <Cicero's> philosophy seems now to have exhausted its influence, it is because it has in great measure been absorbed into the fabric of civilized society.—J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*.

C. A.
Roman H.
Pp. xl, 34.
Already
his valua
Professor
Greek an
Greek Dr
Editions o
Mr. Ro
ceptable
selection
though th
of Americ
cially ind
G. W. Bo
(New Yo
are exten
rendered
with chro
bee's Gre
tion, but
of the Gr
happ alon
and discus
The h
author, i
(George
Jewett);
Dakyns)
Livy, pp.
The Jug
tonius, J
revised b
of Agric
Eviden
designed
seems th
single te
introduct
tory, wit
historian
offers us
McMaste
Hamilton

R. P.
and Hom
Writers
Pp. v, 38
One o
disappea
tary quo
mentary
this gre
in a rati
to this
Saint Je
first, an
canticle.
the Anc
time a t
along w
tary, O
Hebrew
who is
has not
refrain
things t
ing how
ears, w
from th
carnal"
"it is w
on the
Throug
setting,
to the
to the
twofold
and Br
Christ,

Book Reviews

C. A. Robinson, Jr., editor, *Selections from Greek and Roman Historians*. New York, Rinehart Editions, 1957. Pp. xl, 341. \$1.25; paperbound.

Already familiar to a wide and appreciative audience for his valuable research into the history of Alexander the Great, Professor Robinson of Brown University has now added the Greek and Roman Historians to his earlier *Anthology of Greek Drama: First and Second Series*, in the Rinehart Editions of Classical Literature in Translation.

Mr. Robinson has searched diligently to find the most acceptable translations available and has done the work of selection with imagination, courage, and determination. Although the editor is admittedly indebted to a formidable array of American classical historians and philologists, he is especially indebted to his own texts, *Hellenic History* (based on G. W. Botsford) and more recently, his own *Ancient History* (New York 1951). The quotations from the latter especially are extensive. Greater service to the cause might have been rendered by a fresh discussion of Ancient Historiography, with chronological charts or "required reading" to illuminate the periods surveyed in the selections. Professor A. J. Toynbee's *Greek Historical Thought* is available in a cheap edition, but there is still present need for an enlarged study of the Greek and Roman philosophy and art of history, perhaps along the same lines, but with added critical comment and discussion.

The historians, the number of pages devoted to each author, and their translators are: Herodotus, pp. 2-54 (George Rawlinson); Thucydides, pp. 56-127 (Benjamin Jowett); Xenophon, *The Hellenica*, pp. 130-131 (H. G. Dakyns); *Polybius*, pp. 136-160 (Evelyn S. Shuckburgh); Livy, pp. 162-205, (D. Spillan and Cyrus Edmonds); Sallust, *The Jugurthine War*, pp. 208-219 (John S. Watson); Suetonius, *Julius Caesar*, pp. 222-239 (Alexander Thompson, revised by T. Forester); Tacitus, *The Annals, Histories, Life of Agricola, Germania*, pp. 242-341 (Church and Brodribb).

Evidently the volume, which is a compact pocketful, was designed to supplement reading from historical textbooks; it seems that the contents are not specially adapted to use as a single text for a course in Greek and Roman history. The introduction offers a brief resume of Greek and Roman history, with biographical and critical notes on the individual historians. The bibliographical note, compiled by the editor, offers useful addenda.

A. G. McKay

McMaster University,
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

R. P. Lawson, *Origen: The Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies*. Translated and Annotated (*Ancient Christian Writers* 26). Westminster, Maryland, Newman Press, 1957. Pp. v, 385. \$4.00.

One of the great losses to Christian letters has been the disappearance, with the exception of a number of fragmentary quotations, of the Greek text of Origen's great commentary on the Canticle of Canticles. All that is extant of this great work are the first three of the original ten books in a rather free Latin translation by Rufinus. A supplement to this commentary is found in two homilies translated by Saint Jerome into Latin, but these homilies treat only of the first, and part of the second, of the eight chapters of the canticle. With the publication of this important volume in the *Ancient Christian Writers* series, we have for the first time a translation of the commentary into a modern language along with the two homilies. In the prologue to the commentary, Origen warns his readers of one danger recognized by Hebrew teachers before him: "I advise and counsel everyone who is not yet rid of the vexations of flesh and blood and has not ceased to feel the passion of his bodily nature, to refrain completely from reading this little book and the things that will be said about it" (p. 23). "For he, not knowing how to hear love's language in purity and with chaste ears, will twist the whole manner of his hearing of it away from the inner spiritual man and on to the outward and carnal" (p. 22). His own interpretation of the poem is that "it is written in dramatic form and, like a story that is acted on the stage, with dialogue between the characters" (p. 23). Throughout the commentary he strives to give the dramatic setting, ascribing the various verses now to the Bride, now to the Bridegroom, now to the friends of the Bride, and again to the friends of the Groom. To the canticle itself he gives a twofold spiritual interpretation: "The appellations of Bride and Bridegroom denote either the Church in her relation to Christ, or the soul in her union with the Word of God" (p. 58).

The sacred allegory is interpreted throughout with a richness of speculation that was the fruit of his long years of Scriptural and theological studies and with a depth of feeling that was consequent to his own mystical experiences. In reading this very literate translation with its excellent introduction and notes one can appreciate Saint Jerome's judgment of the work: "While Origen surpassed all writers in his other books, in his *Song of Songs* he surpassed himself" (p. 265), and the two homilies added to the commentary, in the words of the same saint, are "a sample of his thinking, so that you may reflect how highly his great thoughts should be esteemed, when even his little ones can so commend themselves" (p. 265).

M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J.

The Creighton University

John F. C. Richards, *Essentials of Latin: An Introductory Course Using Selections from Latin Literature*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1958. Pp. xiii, 323; illustrated. \$4.50.

Professor Richards, in his brief preface, clearly states the aim of his book and how it has already been used. There is no doubt that his is a mature Latin book. Intended originally for undergraduates in the School of General Studies at Columbia University and partly for graduate students who need Latin in various fields for the Ph.D. degree, this book has many admirable qualities but also severely circumscribed limitations.

Essentials of Latin contains forty-one formal lessons—adequate for a college semester. All the necessary material for a beginning Latin student is contained in these lessons. The first ten lessons contain "made Latin." Lesson XI to Lesson XLI contains exercises which employ carefully selected quotations from Latin literature, both poetry and prose, with Caesar and Cicero bulking large. Each lesson contains grammar, followed by vocabulary, notes (actually little more than another vocabulary) on the quotations, the selections from quotations (referred to as Exercise 1), sentences to be translated into English based on the quotations mostly (Exercise 2), and a special feature of this book, questions in Latin related to the quotations (Exercise 3), questions which are to be answered in Latin by the beginning student.

It is most unfortunate that Mr. Richards' book was published after Frederick M. Wheelock's *Latin: An Introductory Course Based on Ancient Authors*.^{*} Professor Wheelock does everything that Professor Richards is trying to do and much more. Wheelock's pedagogical approach is fuller and more effective. There is no need to go into any detailed analysis here, but a few points deserve notice because they are so obvious.

Though Richards' book claims to employ selections from Latin literature, it does not contain even the briefest survey of Latin literature, as Wheelock does in his introduction. An even more serious objection is that the student does not know that he is reading "real" Latin unless he turns to Appendix 7 in Richards' book. Wheelock conveniently places the name of the author in parentheses after the various quotations in the exercise. Wheelock begins with "real" (albeit modified) Latin right away. Richards waits until Lesson XI. Wheelock includes material on the Latin language and lavishly indicates correct pronunciation in vocabulary and grammar. The student is given no help in this regard by Richards. Wheelock's notes on the *Sententiae Antiquae* conveniently follow each quotation; Richards' just as inconveniently precede each section in one large grouping. Wheelock lays little stress on English to Latin exercises; Richards devotes an entire section to such exercises in every lesson. Wheelock lays great emphasis for the English and Romance languages students on etymology, citing derivatives from the Latin in these languages where applicable; Richards lays practically no stress at all on this type of exercise. Richards, however, has questions in Latin to be answered in Latin.

The quotations from the Latin authors that Richards uses are perhaps fuller than Wheelock's, but I think beginners will also find them more difficult. Wheelock has *Loci Antiqui* at the end of his book for further selected reading. Richards has an appendix with three selections from the Gospel of Matthew in the Vulgate. Wheelock's grammatical exegesis is full; Richards' is generally skeletal. Richards presumably leaves a great deal more up to the individual teacher than does Wheelock.

The best part of Richards' book can be found in the appendices—seven of them: (1) The Roman Calendar; (2) Latin Meters; (3) Survey of Grammatical Terms; (4) Three Selections from the Vulgate; (5) Review of Important Constructions; (6) Review of Grammar; (7) Identification of

Quotations from Latin Authors for Lessons XI-XLI. There are also the customary Latin-English and English-Latin vocabularies, a Vocabulary of Persons and Places and a brief Index. The illustrations are good, and there are maps of the Roman Empire printed on the inside covers.

In short, Professor Richards' book is good as far as it goes, but unfortunately there is already in circulation an excellent Latin text by Frederic M. Wheelock which does what Richards sets out to do more fully and more effectively.

Colgate University

John E. Rexine

NOTE

* Cf. my review of Wheelock's book in the *Modern Language Journal* 42 (April 1958) 209-210. Cf. also the review by the Reverend James P. Lienert, MSF., in *CB* 33 (February 1957) 47.

F. E. Adcock, *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (*Sather Classical Lectures* 30). Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1957. Pp. vi, 109. \$3.00.

Professor Adcock, in this admirably compact volume, is not writing a history of ancient warfare; rather, he is concerned with "how the Greeks and Macedonians applied their minds to the art of war" (p. 1). In rapid succession he deals with "The City-State at War," "The Development of Infantry," "Naval Warfare," "Cavalry, Elephants, and Siegecraft," "The Means and Ends of Major Strategy," and "Generalship in Battle." There follow an "Appendix: The Literary Sources" and an "Index."

The author is particularly effective in making clear in the first chapter the nature of an ancient hoplite-versus-hoplite clash; for example, it is "a vehement, concerted effort, short and sharp, for which every man must nerve himself and screw his courage to the sticking point" (p. 9). Of course, a more vivid sense of these clashes is imperishably enshrined in certain of the elegiac fragments of Callinus and Tyrtæus.

Many modern parallels appear, such as the equating "of Athenian naval policy" with Athens' securing "for her commerce the passage of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles" (p. 43). All in all, while not a "popular" book, the volume will stand as a reference of genuine value.

Saint Louis University

William Charles Korfmaier

1960 Marks the 2600th Anniversary of Solon's Birth

*the contemporary significance of a basic
contribution to political theory by one
of the Seven Wise Men . . .*

SOLON AND HIS POLITICAL THEORY

by JOHN E. REXINE

Department of Classics, Colgate University
SOLON's mind has been called one of the most germinal in the political and social sciences. He was the first political scientist to see national events through the eyes of a social historian, the first sociologist to warn that social evils are best understood in terms of the problems which contribute to their history. This new study gives modern readers a concise and thorough account of Solon's activities and interests and a comprehensive appraisal of his profound significance for the modern world.

ONE DOLLAR A COPY

WILLIAM-FREDERICK PRESS
391 EAST 149TH STREET
NEW YORK 55, N. Y.

Please send me copies of *Solon and His*

Political Theory

I am enclosing \$..... in full payment.

Name

Address

City Zone State

Materials Available

through the Office of The Classical Bulletin

Richard E. Arnold, S.J., Editor

CLASSICAL ESSAYS PRESENTED TO JAMES A. KLEIST, S.J.

Containing an INTRODUCTION by the Editor, with articles by Walter R. Agard, William H. Alexander, Norman J. DeWitt, Charles C. Mierow, Clyde Murley, John A. Scott, Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. Each, \$2.50

Thomas P. Byrne, S.J.

FACETE DICTUM: A LATIN READER WITH A DASH OF HUMOR

Light-hearted reading for those with a year and a half or more of systematic training in Latin. Each, \$1.00

General Index

TO VOLUMES 1-25 OF THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN (1924-1949)

Each, 50c

William R. Hennes, S.J., and Richard E. Arnold, S.J. IRIS: A READING LIST OF ARTICLES SELECTED FROM CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

Chosen from nine periodicals from the beginning of each until August 1, 1941. Each, \$1.50

Leo M. Kaiser

T. MACCIUS PLAUTUS, THE CAPTIVES: EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND VOCABULARY

Intended for rapid reading in lower classes.

Each, \$1.25

William C. Korfmaier

OTHLONI LIBELLUS PROVERBIORUM

Critical and annotated edition of an eleventh-century proverb collection. Each, \$2.00

O. J. Kuhnmuensch, S.J.

AIDS FOR THE RHYTHMIC READING OF VERGIL

SOME AIDS TO LATIN

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.

CLASSICAL BOOKS FOR HIGH SCHOOL NEEDS

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Sense-Line Texts . . .

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO PRIMA
(Peterson)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO TERTIA
(Bachhuber)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO QUARTA
(Glunta)

Cicero, PRO ARCHIA (Peterson)

Each, 25c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 20c

Address:

The Classical Bulletin

221 North Grand Boulevard

Saint Louis 3, Missouri

All items are sent plus postage

rtin

with
Alex-
row,
ulli-
2.50

H A

and
atin.
1.00

50c

S.J.

s
ning
1.50

1.25

nth-
2.00

a, 4c

a, 4c

20c